

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2014  
6:00 PM**

ATTENDANCE: Co-chair Paoletto; Co-chair Martinez-Walker  
Council members: DeJesus, Martinez, Torres, Vizzo-Paniccia

NON-COMMITTEE: Council member Feliciano

CITY STAFF: City Attorney Mark Anastasi  
Jodie Paul-Arndt; Deputy CAO/CityStat Director  
Kristen duBay Horton; Director Health & Social Services  
Warren Blunt; Health & Social Services  
Deborah Caviness; Small & Minority Business Resource Office

OTHER(s): Bill Robinson; WPCA General Counsel, Glen Santora; Outside Counsel

Co-chair Paoletto called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm.

Approval of Committee Minutes: March 25, 2014 (Regular Meeting)

**\*\* CO-CHAIR MARTINEZ-WALKER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Co-chair Paoletto stated that the agenda would be taken out of order.

**61-13** Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6.04 Animal Control Regulations Generally, amend Section 6.04.010 Keeping of Certain Animals Prohibited.

Co-chair Paoletto stated that the committee came up with different wording, but it wasn't clarified at the last meeting. He pointed out that the text highlighted in *black* outlined what was originally submitted to the committee and the text highlighted in *red* outlined the sections that pertained to what they previously discussed – *a copy of the modifications were submitted and reviewed*. It was noted that Warren Blunt

and Kristen duBay Horton from the health department were present to answer questions.

Council member Torres had a question about **bullet point #3**; he questioned whether or not the information should apply to a single family also. Ms. duBay Horton responded that there are a number of single families that are rented in the north end.

Council member Martinez had a question about **bullet point #7**; she asked what kind of containment the chickens would be housed. Mr. Blunt pointed out that that information was found on page-1 in the box under the heading Space. He added that specific area and ventilation will be required. Co-chair Paoletto added that the container can be metal or wood, noting that was the intention of the last bullet point.

Council member Martinez asked the amount that will be charged for a permit. Co-chair Paoletto referred to **bullet point #9** *that outlined the fees*.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker said she had a concern about having sufficient manpower to monitor the chicken coops, chickens or hens. She explained that her concern was the issue that housing chickens would get out of hand and she didn't think it was a good idea for the city.

Council member Torres recalled that at the last meeting, Council member DeJesus had a concern about 4-family dwellings and the potential of an out of control situation housing too many chickens. Mr. Blunt responded that the final say will have to go through the health department. For instance, if it's a 4-family house this would equate to (24) chickens and this set up would be prohibited.

Council member Torres commented that since he knows people that raise chickens, he would rather have more regulation in place than it is already and he was in support of that.

Mr. Blunt stated that a preliminary training session was held and forty (40) people attended. His statement was in response to Council member Martinez's question about how people would be informed about the ordinance. She also commented that if they were conducting mandatory training sessions, it should be included in the information – *it was pointed out that that information was outlined on page-10*.

Ms. duBay Horton stated that every person that has been cited within the last twelve months that house chickens have been notified about the training.

Council member Martinez asked if they've had any reaction or complaints from the community about the ordinance. Mr. Blunt replied that there haven't been any more than the usual complaints they receive.

Council member DeJesus agreed that the amount of chickens that 4-family dwellings are allowed should be limited in response to Mr. Blunt's previous statement.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia stated that it will be difficult to limit the number of chickens for multi-family dwellings. She said she would be contacting the health department to report more issues with people that raise chickens. She commented that she would vote against the item. She went on to say that she felt that this is something that the city doesn't need, because they don't have the funds or staff to monitor the situation. She said she also felt it was a waste of time discussing the matter. She added that it could also present a problem of clogging the catch basins that will result in an increase of rodents that aren't needed.

Council member Martinez expressed that she didn't feel the matter is that complicated and she thought the current ordinance wasn't sufficient to address those that already have chickens. She stated that she was looking to do what's right and that she would vote in favor of the ordinance.

Council member Torres stated that he wasn't sure of what the logic was for not wanting to provide more strength to the health department, wherein at least the matter will be monitored and more professionalized with the proper training and a fee applied. He said he felt that they were trying to put their arms around a problem and he didn't think the issue of raising chickens was going to go away.

Co-chair Paoletto clarified that the matter only pertained to keeping chickens for the production of eggs.

Mr. Blunt stated that they don't encourage slaughtering of animals. The ordinance is only for raising chickens as pets and for egg consumption, in response to Council member Martinez's comment about the reason the hens can't be used for a food source.

Ms. duBay Horton stated that the prior ordinance outlined that they can't have chickens unless they are authorized by the health department. However, that policy wasn't meant to be arbitrary and the reason for the ordinance is to provide some guidance.

Albertina Baptiste, of the Health Department was present. She stated that it was their intention to try to provide the proper guidance in the past and the issue of keeping chickens has existed for a long time and it's not going away. She noted that guidance and assistance will be available to answer questions that are raised and training will be provided to residents to do it in a responsible manner.

Mr. Blunt stated that the training session was recorded as it was suggested by Council member Torres and they may also provide a CD for public information. He emphasized that this is a serious matter and it won't be an inexpensive endeavor for residents that are looking to raise chickens; so he didn't feel the matter would be taken lightly.

Council member DeJesus said he had a concern on the heels of the budget and fighting off a tax increase per the \$50.00 yearly fee that will be required. He questioned if they had an estimate of what the manpower cost would be for the inspections. For example, if a resident has sick chickens, will they be obligated to notify their insurance company to cover the problem and possibly their neighbor. Mr. Blunt replied that if the ordinance is passed, the health department has the obligation to ensure that things are done correctly.

City Attorney Anastasi stated that the committee should not be adopting the ordinance if they don't believe that the health department has the resources to enforce it.

Co-chair Paoletto raised a point about people that have other types of pets, such as; cats, dogs etc. related to the question of insurance coverage. He explained that his point wasn't so much a legal concern, but more to do with a department with limited resources, staff and personnel and the need to decide how the resources should be spent. However, he said if Mr. Blunt feels that the department is equipped to handle the situation, then they are well advised to do so; but he noted that he didn't actually hear that is the case yet.

Council member Torres reiterated that the ordinance should assure more control over the situation. He repeated that he has known people with chickens for years and it hasn't seemed to spur more people to get them, just because others have them.

Ms. duBay Horton explained the breakout of what the \$50.00 fee would cover in response to the approximate cost of manpower that will be required to do inspections.

Mr. Blunt stated that they also have to allow for complaints that might need to be investigated. He said that the pre-inspection will be to ensure that they are set up properly according to the specifications required and based on that, there will be one inspection conducted every year. Council member Torres commented that maintenance of a chicken coop doesn't require any special requirements other than holding itself up. Mr. Blunt emphasized that they will be diligent about inspections to ensure that the chickens are healthy.

Ms. Baptiste stated that right now, for persons that have chickens; they don't have any way of knowing where they come from. So again, that's the reason to put the ordinance in place to monitor all this.

Council member Martinez asked what type of paperwork will be required. Mr. Blunt said the paperwork will need to be filled out to provide pertinent information.

*There was some open discussion regarding the following:*

- *Chickens that may be bought from an un-credited supplier*
- *If un-credited chickens are found, they will need to be bought to a veterinarian to ensure that they are healthy*
- *The average price of a chicken purchase is between \$5.00 and \$6.00*

Co-chair Martinez-Walker asked about violations and penalties and what will be the maximum cut off for the violation period that will be allowed. And who will be responsible for the removal of the chickens and assessing the violation. Mr. Blunt stated that will depend on what the violation is. He explained that there will be an inspection and if nothing is one, the animal shelter will be contacted and the chickens will be removed and probably taken to the zoo upon clearance from the veterinarian.

Co-chair Paoletto questioned what normally happens if the violation isn't corrected. Mr. Blunt said they give the order for the resident to voluntarily remove them and if they go back and they're still there; then they will prosecute and/or contact the animal shelter.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia reiterated that she thought the discussion was a waste of energy. She compared the matter to barking up a tree without having all

the answers and she thought they were approaching the matter in a *half-assed manner*. Mr. Blunt responded that they have to give a certain number of days to answer to the violation. Ms. duBay Horton added that they don't actually go through the court system unless the health department fails to address the problem. Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned where the legal boundaries start then. She emphasized again that many details haven't been thought through and she was displeased with the way the issue was going.

Co-chair Paoletto stated that despite what was said, Council member Vizzo-Paniccia won't agree. He emphasized that he resented her comments that the matter was a waste of time and he clarified that all the agenda items are purposeful and the implication that the matter is being rushed are unfounded. He further emphasized that it was upsetting to hear her suggest that the matter is being rushed and shoved through. He stated that everyone's opinions are valid.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO APPROVE  
\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED  
\*\* MOTION FAILED TO PASS WITH TWO VOTES IN FAVOR AND THREE  
VOTES IN OPPOSITION (COUNCIL MEMBERS: VIZZO-PANICCIA,  
DeJESUS, MARTINEZ-WALKER)**

**71-13** Proposed Amendments to WPCA Bridgeport Code of Ordinance,  
Chapter 13.04 - Utilities

Co-chair Paoletto stated that this item wasn't on the agenda and he was notified that it would be added to the agenda tonight. He asked the nature of the emergency. City Attorney Anastasi stated that to accommodate and coincide with the budget cycle for WPCA, it was important to act in a certain timeline. He requested to move forward with the item for the sake of accommodating WPCA.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia recalled that during previous committee meetings, they were told that adding an item to the agenda wasn't allowed unless it's advertised for a regular meeting. Co-chair Paoletto clarified that if there is a two-thirds vote to add the item to the agenda, it can be added. City Attorney Anastasi stated that all regular meetings are publicized and it's legal to add an item with a two-thirds vote according to FOI (Freedom of Information). However, he explained that if the item wasn't given to the committee then it couldn't be added and taken up, but it was added to the agenda during the city council meeting held on April 21. He urged the committee to allow the matter to go forward for the purpose of this

year's rate cycle. He further explained that WPCA only voted on the matter last week, per Co-chair Paoletto's comment about the need to expedite the matter.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO ADD THE ITEM TO THE AGENDA**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Attorney Anastasi explained that special outside counsel Glen Santora was present from WPCA to lead the discussion and Bill Robinson, WPCA general counsel was also present.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia asked if this item was a conflict with the potential new contract for the change in management. Attorney Anastasi replied no.

Mr. Santora explained that the primary purpose of the amendment is to conclude to charge customers not only on water consumption, but also on volume of sewage. He clarified that was the primary purpose of the change to the ordinance. He stated that it's common with other utility companies to rate based on volume of sewage.

Mr. Robinson explained that for industrial applications, they typically use 150-gallons per day in the bathroom and 50,000 gallons may be deposited per day. He said that the ordinance doesn't correctly affect that ability, so it doesn't apply to the private homeowner who will still be billed on water consumption, but it will apply to any customer of WPCA.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia asked if the money that will be generated will go into the change. Mr. Robinson said it will be part of the portion of the WPCA budget to cover everything.

Council member Martinez asked if there will be extra fee to the homeowner. Mr. Santora responded no; it will result in a more accurate metering assessment for someone not in residential. It will only affect homeowners where the volume of sewage may apply and the Town of Trumbull. Attorney Anastasi said the change will more fairly charge certain users for the services they're using.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker asked if it will only apply to industrial and commercial users. Mr. Robinson said he didn't see any example where a residential property will see the difference in billing. For example, if ground water remediation is

conducted on a property, then the resident may see an increase until the remediation is completed. Mr. Robinson noted that there are a couple of commercial businesses in Bridgeport that are billed on volume of sewage, he gave an example of a business that his pertained to.

Council member Torres asked if most of the water coming through is residential water. Mr. Santora responded yes, presumably. Council member Torres asked then if there should be some method to standardize the volume of sewage. Attorney Anastasi replied that they were engaged in litigation with the Town of Trumbull to clarify that if there was a question of methodology; that topic needed to be discussed in a closed executive session. Mr. Santora responded that the amount of volume of sewage sent by Trumbull to the border is higher than metered residents. So they were looking to make it fairer to track a rate equal to volume.

Council member Torres stated that based on the numbers, he questioned if Trumbull rates would go up or down. Mr. Santora said if the rate changed, for any customer that has a higher metered water use as of July 1; the amount they pay will go up.

Council member Torres asked about those with well water. Mr. Robinson said they will also have to connect to the sanitary sewer system.

Council member Torres questioned if there was a scenario where a resident homeowner in Bridgeport will see an increase in their bill. Attorney Anastasi clarified it's an option and not a mandate, only for the purpose of capturing demand and use on the system. He noted that none of it will apply to residences in Bridgeport that he is aware of.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned what will happen when a swimming pool is drained. Attorney Anastasi stated it will be impossible to separate the system for pool water usage. Mr. Robinson added that north of Boston Avenue is probably the only area that may be affected by that and the water is discharged to WPCA is metered out or metered in.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker had a question on page-5; Section 13.04.290 under Rates. It was stated that the change was included to not only water consumption, but also volume of sewage – *it was clarified that bullet point-A applied to residential; however, all residential customers should be metered for water volume use, **not** volume of sewage.* It was further noted that the housing authority is



charged the same uniform rate with no discount, per Council member Vizzo-Paniccia's question.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia asked if every home in Bridgeport is covered by WPCA. Mr. Santora said there are several septic systems in Bridgeport that aren't connected to WPCA. She further questioned where the sewage goes then. It was stated that it's suppose to go into a leeching field.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker suggested adding wording to the ordinance to reflect: *If and how it will affect residential customers*. Mr. Robinson stated that the ordinance outlines that that is decided by WPCA if it's found that they need to bill a customer differently. Attorney Anastasi added that there has to be a justification for it and he clarified that this change is only an attempt to address uniquely situated customers. Mr. Santora repeated that normally residential is billed by metered water use only.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ MOVED TO APPROVE**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DeJESUS SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**\*Consent calendar**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ MOVED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**41-13** Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code of Ordinances, amend Chapter 9.08 Offenses Pertaining to Property.

Jodie Paul-Arndt stated that she would review the sections of the ordinance that were revised. She began with Section 9.08.070 Graffiti on page-2; letter-B. She noted that the last part of the sentence was deleted – *as outlined in the document*.

#4 of the section was reviewed. Council member Vizzo-Paniccia asked how they make allowances for art form type graffiti versus advertisement for a business. It was stated that art form graffiti will be enforced by the Anti-Blight Department and it's up to the discretion of the person who writes the violation notice. It was clarified that the ordinance only pertained to a specific graffiti offense in relation to putting graffiti on a building.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned again why a representative from the Purchasing Department wasn't present tonight. Ms. Paul-Arndt said they were planning a presentation and they were waiting to elicit more information of what should be covered during the presentation. Council member Vizzo-Paniccia said she felt that the purchasing part should have been done first before the ordinance changes were made.

Ms. Paul-Arndt reviewed page-2 that outlined the Increase in Fees. Council member Martinez questioned who would be responsible for paying for a minor's offense. Ms. Paul-Arndt replied that would be the parent(s) responsibility.

Council member Torres commented that he was pleased with the changes that were discussed and he supported the ordinance.

Ms. Paul-Arndt went on to review the other changes that were outlined. Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned if the employees are responsible for enforcing the ordinance. Ms. Paul-Arndt said there is a current requirement to enforce the ordinance and catch offenders, but it won't require any additional resources. She clarified that the matter is monitored through the police department. City Attorney Anastasi added that there may be times when policing of the matter will be increased if there is a need.

Council member Martinez questioned if the amount of fines collected within the last year was known. Ms. Paul-Arndt speculated that the amount was low, noting that it was difficult to catch an offender. Council member Martinez questioned then why there is an increase in the fee. Ms. Paul-Arndt said the increase was implemented to be used as a deterrent.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned if they're able to confirm the identification of an offender what will happen. Ms. Paul-Arndt said the matter is still up to the police and they would need probable cause and have to maintain a standard of evidence.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DeJESUS SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE VOTE IN**  
**OPPOSITION (COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA)**

**\*Not on consent calendar**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ MOVED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC**  
**HEARING**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**37-13** Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.08 Building Permits and Fees, amend Sections 15.08.010 Building permit and related fees and Section 15.08.020 Building permits to be withheld due to delinquent taxes and user fees.

Ms. Paul-Arndt stated that she would review the changes that were discussed in February. She clarified that only one word was changed from the original document – *on page-3 (the letter-K was added and letter-L) as it was outlined and read. The word “shall” was revised to read “may”*. This change pertained to having a dumpster on site for people that may leave construction materials on site during remodeling or renovations. She reviewed *page-5; letter-B*. The wording was revised to change “shall” to “may”. It was clarified that there is still a requirement to submit in writing, but the change opens it up to other avenues.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia commented that having a dumpster on site needs to be outlined to designate a specific area. Ms. Paul-Arndt said enforcement of where a dumpster is located is up to the specific department that would handle it, such as Public Facilities Department. Attorney Anastasi made the point that the location of a dumpster is easily monitored, because the company that delivers it, generally knows where it’s supposed to go.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO APPROVE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DeJESUS SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE VOTE IN OPPOSITION**

**\*Not on consent calendar**

**\*\*\**please see below, this motion was rescinded and a second motion was made and voted upon.***

***Council member Torres and Council member Martinez rescinded the above motion and the second to the motion.***

It was clarified that on *page-3; letter-K – the word “shall” should be deleted and substituted for the word “may”*.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO AMEND TO REPLACE THE WORD “SHALL” AND SUBSTITUTE WITH THE WORD “MAY”**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED**

**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO APPROVE AS AMENDED**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED WITH FOUR VOTES IN FAVOR AND ONE VOTE IN**  
**OPPOSITION (COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA)**

**\*Not on consent calendar**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES MOVED TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC**  
**HEARING**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**39-13** Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8.76 Anti-Blight Program, amend Section 8.76.020 Definitions, Section 8.76.040 Enforcement and adding New Section 8.76.052 Allocation of Capital Gain.

Ms. Paul-Arndt stated she didn't have an updated version of the ordinance and she needed clarification of the revisions. She explained that the language that was adopted by the state reads an amount up to \$250.00; so they were looking to resubmit the amount from \$100.00 to \$250.00 – *she referred to page-5-Section 8.76.040*. She said they were looking to continue to enforce the fine at \$100.00 per day up to thirty days and after thirty days, it will be \$250.00 per day.

The Allocation of Capital Gain was reviewed. It was explained that the money doesn't go to the fund balance and it's set up as a special revenue account. She questioned if it would be appropriate to set other parameters for use of the account. Attorney Anastasi stated that usually, the money goes into the general fund, noting that's the reason for approval of the way it's currently set up that has been approved by OPM.

Council member Martinez stated that she was familiar with the fines that residents get and she thought that it's a sufficient amount of money that should be put into the general fund and go through the budget.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia questioned if there was any specific reason why the money can't go into the general fund. She said she would like to see where it will be distributed and if there is a specific column set up for it. Attorney Anastasi said the only money they have control over is city money.

Council member Vizzo-Paniccia requested that for the next meeting, a representative from the Finance Department, Tom Sherwood from OPM, Andrew Nunn and any others that oversee the ordinance be present to answer questions.

Council member Feliciano questioned why not set up a special revenue account for the fees that are collected. Ms. Paul-Arndt responded that Anti-Blight doesn't have a separate budget, because they're part of the Office of Planning & Economic Development (OPED).

Council member Martinez stated that she has witnessed through the budget process, that when a department needs something; they ask for it and when they receive fees, it's reported to the budget and should be requested through the budget. Ms. Paul-Arndt suggested that perhaps they could apply a certain cap on the amount requested.

Ms. Paul-Arndt concluded her review and she noted that she will continue to define the wording of "*dilapidated*" and provide an update on the other changes at the next meeting.

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ MOVED TO TABLE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**38-13** Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Code of Ordinances, Chapter 3.12 Equal Opportunity Requirements for Contractors, amend Section 3.12.130 Minority Business Enterprise Program.

Ms. Paul-Arndt stated that she would review the changes for clarification and will resubmit the revisions for the next meeting. It was noted that the item would be tabled until the next meeting.

Council member Martinez recalled her previous request to add the wording "*Latino*" as it pertained to the 6% minority contractors section. Co-chair Paoletto concurred that the matter was previously brought up and reviewed on page-6 under Definitions -city based business. Attorney Anastasi stated that Ms. Paul-Arndt was working with Attorney Pacacha on this matter and he said they would reserve the right to submit the modified document at the next meeting.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker had a question about page-7; she questioned what is the difference between formal and informal contracts and why the increase. Ms. Paul-Arndt explained that when they are dealing with a value of work, the

contractors aren't willing to share in a smaller contract price; so the increase amount will make it easier to do business. Ms. Caviness added that if there is a small \$30k contract and they are looking to subcontract, it amounts to a lot and the contractor isn't generally open to accepting a lower amount. *Attorney Anastasi clarified that it's operational inefficient for a contractor and economically inefficient for the city.*

Council member Torres commented that the change would affect an end to the change for contracts. He questioned if there was another way to consider contracts of less than \$100k in aggregate that must apply to the percentages.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker had a question about page-11; letter-D. Ms. Paul-Arndt stated that the 10% applied only to city-based business and that the 30% was firm and specifically implemented and can't be changed.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker had a question about page-17 regarding Mandatory Good Faith Efforts; *she read a suggested amendment.* Ms. Caviness explained that there is a waiver process and there are specific criteria to adhere to pertaining to as follows: a) notice in the newspaper b) reaching out to minority contractors c) scheduling a conference with her office d) notice on the website.

Co-chair Martinez-Walker asked what the current penalty was. Ms. Caviness said it's currently \$200 per day and if they are found to be repeat violations, then the company can be barred from participating.

*A brief informational and open discussion took place to discuss the following:*

- *Percentage of people who applied for waivers and received them – the guesstimate was between 10 and 15 people*
- *The occurrence of a situation at a site where they weren't using proper MBE's – it was noted that investigations have occurred in the past and the business was fined*
- *Who else oversees the contracts – it was stated that the Purchasing Department also oversees the contracts*
- *The necessity to look at the same contractors that receive 30% of the contracts, in terms of what methodology is used to ensure that they reach out to as many contractors as possible – it was stated that a contractor needs to be registered on BIDSync.com for all the bids that are publicized by the city. The person that is registered will receive notification for all city*

*contracts and they can check off their specific commodity to be notified of those contracts that are posted in the future*

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO TABLE**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DeJESUS SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**ADJOURNED**

**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER VIZZO-PANICCIA MOVED TO ADJOURN**  
**\*\* COUNCIL MEMBER DeJESUS SECONDED**  
**\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Graham  
Telesco Secretarial Services